

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Office Action mailed 1/25/07, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1-10, 29, 30 and 32-35 are still pending.

In the Office Action of 1/25/07, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 and 29-35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Applicant has reviewed the various statements made by the Examiner and have amended the respective claims to correct the language to distinctly claim the embodiments of the invention. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amended claims overcome the rejection and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 3-9, 29 and 31-35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Beadle et al. (U.S. Patent 7,039,709; “Beadle”) and rejected claims 2, 4, 6-8, 10, 30, 32, 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the same Beadle reference. Applicant submits that Beadle fails to disclose the elements of the independent claims, as amended, for the following reasons.

Beadle discloses a method, system and program product for utilization within a client that provides an optimal connection between the client and a network. The client is provided with multiple connection media and the best route for completing the connection request is selected.

With the claimed embodiments of the invention, a primary routing is established in a node identification (ID) register for a peripheral bus transaction. However, the node ID register also includes a node routing table containing one or more alternate override routing that overrides the primary routing when the peripheral bus transaction is of a particular type. In one instance, alternate override routing is used when a peripheral bus transaction is a cache coherency transaction and in another instance, the alternate override routing is used with an input/output transaction. Thus, when the alternate override routing is used, it is dependent on the type of transaction for a destination address and not necessarily for optimum connections. Thus, Applicant submits that the

amended claims distinguish over Beadle and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections.

Accordingly, Applicant solicits the Examiner for allowance of pending claims 1-10, 29, 30 and 32-35, as amended.

Furthermore, in order to respond to the outstanding office action, Applicant is submitting a petition for one-month extension of time under a separate cover.

Fees for the extension and RCE are also included with this submission. However, if there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON
(Customer No. 51472)

Date: 5-25-2007

By: William W. Kidd
William W. Kidd
Reg. No. 31,772
Phone: (512) 263-1842
Fax No: (512) 263-1469
Email:wkidd@texaspatents.com